



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/624,122 | 07/21/2003 | Martyn Gilbert | F0320 | 8036 |
| 48745 | 7590 | 02/06/2007 | | |
| SILBER & FRIDMAN 1037 ROUTE 46 EAST SUITE 207 CLIFTON, NJ 07013 | | | EXAMINER WASEL, MOHAMED A | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2154 | PAPER NUMBER |
| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | | | MAIL DATE | |
| 3 MONTHS | | | 02/06/2007 | |
| | | | DELIVERY MODE PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/624,122

Applicant(s)

GILBERT ET AL.

Examiner

Mohamed Wasel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/9/2004
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2154

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to application filed on January 20, 2004. Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 9-11 have been cancelled. Claims 1-8 and 12-14 are presented for examination.

Abstract

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Content of Specification

- (a) Title of the Invention: See 37 CFR 1.72(a) and MPEP § 606. The title of the invention should be placed at the top of the first page of the specification unless the title is provided in an application data sheet. The title of the invention should be brief but technically accurate and descriptive, preferably from two to seven words may not contain more than 500 characters.
- (b) Cross-References to Related Applications: See 37 CFR 1.78 and MPEP § 201.11.
- (c) Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research and Development: See MPEP § 310.
- (d) The Names Of The Parties To A Joint Research Agreement: See 37 CFR 1.71(g).
- (e) Incorporation-By-Reference Of Material Submitted On a Compact Disc: The specification is required to include an incorporation-by-reference of electronic documents that are to become part of the permanent United States Patent and Trademark Office records in the file of a patent application. See 37 CFR 1.52(e) and MPEP § 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text were permitted as electronic documents on compact discs beginning on September 8, 2000.
- (f) Background of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(c). The specification should set forth the Background of the Invention in two parts:
 - (1) Field of the Invention: A statement of the field of art to which the invention pertains. This statement may include a paraphrasing of the applicable U.S.

Art Unit: 2154

patent classification definitions of the subject matter of the claimed invention. This item may also be titled "Technical Field."

- (2) Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98: A description of the related art known to the applicant and including, if applicable, references to specific related art and problems involved in the prior art which are solved by the applicant's invention. This item may also be titled "Background Art."
- (g) Brief Summary of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37 CFR 1.73. The summary is separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole. The summary may point out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). In chemical cases it should point out in general terms the utility of the invention. If possible, the nature and gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an understanding of the invention.
- (h) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s): See MPEP § 608.01(f). A reference to and brief description of the drawing(s) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.74.
- (i) Detailed Description of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(g). A description of the preferred embodiment(s) of the invention as required in 37 CFR 1.71. The description should be as short and specific as is necessary to describe the invention adequately and accurately. Where elements or groups of elements, compounds, and processes, which are conventional and generally widely known in the field of the invention described and their exact nature or type is not necessary for an understanding and use of the invention by a person skilled in the art, they should not be described in detail. However, where particularly complicated subject matter is involved or where the elements, compounds, or processes may not be commonly or widely known in the field, the specification should refer to another patent or readily available publication which adequately describes the subject matter.
- (j) Claim or Claims: See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(m). The claim or claims must commence on separate sheet or electronic page (37 CFR 1.52(b)(3)). Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation. There may be plural indentations to further segregate subcombinations or related steps. See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(i)-(p).
- (k) Abstract of the Disclosure: See MPEP § 608.01(f). A brief narrative of the disclosure as a whole in a single paragraph of 150 words or less commencing on a separate sheet following the claims. In an international application which has entered the national stage (37 CFR 1.491(b)), the applicant need not submit an abstract commencing on a separate sheet if an abstract was published with the international application under PCT Article 21. The abstract that appears on the cover page of the pamphlet published by the International Bureau (IB) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is the abstract that will be used by the USPTO. See MPEP § 1893.03(e).
- (l) Sequence Listing: See 37 CFR 1.821-1.825 and MPEP §§ 2421-2431. The requirement for a sequence listing applies to all sequences disclosed in a given application, whether the sequences are claimed or not. See MPEP § 2421.02.

Claim Objections

Claims 2-8 are objected to because of the following informalities: "**A** browser program..." needs to be changed to "**The** browser program...". Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: "**A** markup language ..." needs to be changed to "**The** markup language...". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1- 8 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 is directed to a browser program (**software program**), which does not fall within the four statutory classes of 101. Appropriate corrections are required where applicable to overcome the 101 rejections.

Claims 2-8 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 due to their dependency.

Claim 12 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 12 due to their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2154

Claim 1 recites the limitation "carry out **the** method steps of" in line 2 of claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "including at least **the** steps of examining..." in line 2 of claim 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Guthrie US Patent No. 6,266,681.

1. As per claim 1, Guthrie teaches a browser program (**col. 2 lines 64-67; browser application**) which, when executed by a suitable device, causes the device to carry out the method steps of:

examining data received as a page comprising page data and mark up language tags and identifying the mark up language tags (**col. 1 lines 41-59**);

analysing the identified tags to derive instructions and generating a visual output derived from the page data based on instructions derived from the identified tags (**col. 1 line 60 – col. 2 line 21, abstract**); and

carrying out further operations based on instructions derived from the identified tags and not derived from the page data (**col. 3 lines 30-41**).

2. As per claim 2, Guthrie teaches browser program in which the visual output derived from the page data is suitable for display in a display region of a visual display unit and the further operations

define the size of the display region or elements to be displayed on the visual display unit outside or overlaying the display region (*col. 2 lines 11-21*).

3. As per claim 3, Guthrie teaches a browser program in which the visual output derived from the page data can be generated by one or more functional sections of the device and the other operations include sending instructions to other functional sections of the device or to other devices (*col. 6 line 41 – col. 7 line 6*).

4. As per claim 4, Guthrie teaches a browser program in which the other operations include the display of text identified by the tags (*col. 1 lines 41-59*).

5. As per claim 5, Guthrie teaches a browser program in which the other operations include the display of text derived from the tags (*col. 1 lines 41-59*).

6. As per claim 7, Guthrie teaches a browser program in which the other operations include the device requesting and responding to user commands (*col. 15 line 51 – col. 16 line 12*).

7. As per claim 8, Guthrie teaches a browser program in which the page is a web page suitable for transmission through the Internet (*col. 3 lines 18-29, abstract*).

8. As per claim 12, Guthrie teaches a markup language tag for use with a browser program (*col. 2 lines 64-67*) adapted to carry out a method including at least the steps of examining data received as a page and generating a visual output derived from the page data, said markup language tag (*col. 1 lines 41-59*) comprising:

said markup language tag being associated with page data to form a page and adapted to cause said browser program to carry out said method (*col. 8 lines 18-34; Fig. 6*).

9. As per claim 13, Guthrie teaches a markup language tag further comprising a page incorporating the markup language tag, wherein said visual output is based on instructions derived from the identified tag (*col. 3 lines 18-29*).

Art Unit: 2154

10. Claim 14 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guthrie US Patent No. 6,266,681 in view Thomsen US Patent No. 6,862,596.

11. As per claim 6, Guthrie fails to explicitly disclose a browser program in which the other operations include requesting a smart card reader to carry out a transaction with a smart card

However, Thomsen discloses a browser program in which the other operations include requesting a smart card reader to carry out a transaction with a smart card (*col. 4 lines 35-48*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicants' invention to combine the teachings of Guthrie and Thomsen because it provides an efficient way of paying for online services through a web page.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please refer to form PTO-892 (*Notice of Reference Cited*) for a list of relevant prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohamed Wasel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2669. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:00 am - 5:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MW

January 24, 2007


NATHAN J. FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800